



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,820	11/04/2003	Dominic Bennett	10005.001900	6243
31894 7590 12/26/2006 OKAMOTO & BENEDICTO, LLP P.O. BOX 641330 SAN JOSE, CA 95164			EXAMINER HAILU, TADESSE	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/26/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,820

Applicant(s)

BENNETT ET AL.

Examiner

Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Appeal Brief submitted on October 4, 2006 for the above identified patent application number.
2. Applicant's arguments, see Argument in the Appeal Brief, filed October 4, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-20, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042821 A1 by Muret et al. ("Muret"); and the rejection of claims 4, 5, 6, 12, 21, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083067 A1 by Tamayo et al. ("Tamayo") have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the references below.
3. The pending claims 1 through 25 are examined and rejected herein as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 14-20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd et al (U.S. 6,112,238) in view of Whiting (US Pub 2002/0156552).

With regard to claims 1, 14 and 17:

Boyd et al ("Boyd") relates generally to remote traffic data analysis and more particularly to a system and method for analyzing remote traffic data in a distributed computing environment.

By analyzing the remote traffic data, the system generally intended to provide useful information about visitor interaction with a website and associated website performance, thereby allowing business decisions to be made that will ideally maximize financial return and/or performance of a website.

The method for analyzing remote traffic data to determine the performance of a website in a distributed computing environment comprising:

The server **10** receiving navigation data in terms of traffic data from a plurality of client computers (e.g. sources of traffic data **11** originated from at least a remote system **12** and direct connection **17**) are shown interconnected with the server 10 over a network connection 13 (Fig. 1). The format used in storing each traffic data 11 and an example of a traffic data hit 11 is shown in Figs. 3A-5. For example, each of the navigation data representing traffic data 11 identifies different websites visited by a user of a client computer, that is

each accessed or navigated site is stored under REFER SITE 37 (Fig. 3A) or under TABLE 40A within container file 41 (Fig. 5).

The raw traffic data 11 received by the server 10 and preferably stored a log file 15, although a **database 16** ("first database") or other storage structure can be used (column 3, lines 43-49, Fig. 1).

Each access by a remote user to the server 10 results in a "hit" of raw traffic data 11. Access information is collected from traffic data hits 11 and summarized by the server 10 into analysis results 18A-C (block 21. The server 10, examines and analyses the traffic data hit 11 that are stored in the database 16) ("first database") to generate relevant traffic data; and stores the information obtained from said relevant traffic data as analysis results **18A-C** ("second database") (Fig. 1).

The analysis results 18A-C are processed for generating report summaries 19A-C of the access information which identify trends, statistics and other information, That is, the method 20 uses the analysis results 18A-C of traffic data hits 11 as collected in to the log file 15 or database 16 for building activity, geographic, demographic and other report summaries 19A-C, such as listed in Table 1 (column 4).

These report summaries may be generated selectively on-demand basis. Thus, the method analyzes and summarizes the access information recorded for a user-requested time (user provided criteria) frame on an ad hoc basis in a single pass through the analysis results 18A-C. Boyd does not seem to

explicitly describe, "the report being generated in accordance with user provided criteria." Whiting which is related to the current invention and Boyd discloses a system/method for collecting textual log file data related to live streaming and on-demand media delivery in a searchable database from which reports may be generated and analysis performed.

Whiting further discloses a user interface that allows a user to generate reports based on selected criteria (Abstract, par. 14).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the user involvement or interaction in generating reports as described in Whiting with Boyd because it allows user generated report based on his/her chosen criteria.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Boyd with Whiting to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 14 and 17.

With regard to claims 2 and 18:

Boyd in view of Whiting further describes that the format used in storing each traffic data 11 at the client computer comprise REFER SITE 37 (Fig. 3A), URL used to obtain web site information for performing the "hit." (Boyd, column 5, lines 65-66).

With regard to claims 3 and 19:

Boyd in view of Whiting further describes that the format used in storing each traffic data 11 at the client computer comprise RFC931 (HOST NAME) 31

(Boyd, FIG. 3A), used to store the host domain name of website visited by the user of the client computer.

With regard to claims 7 and 24:

Boyd in view of Whiting discloses that the generated report includes traffic information of websites in a particular category of websites (Boyd, column 6, lines 42-column 7, lines 8, Fig. 4, category of websites 40A-C).

With regard to claims 9 and 25:

Boyd in view of Whiting discloses the analysis report that includes website traffic information that may be cross-referenced with an enterprise's legacy demographic and transaction data (Whiting, par. 7).

With regard to claim 10:

Boyd in view of Whiting discloses that the report includes information about traffic to a set of uniform resource locators specified in the user provided criteria (Whiting, Pars. 12 and 14).

With regard to claim 11:

Boyd in view of Whiting describes collectively storing the user's total visit (navigation data) to the server in analysis result database (18A-C)(second database) (Boyd, column 11, lines 15-21).

With regard to claim 15:

Boyd in view of Whiting describes that providing a status of a report requested by way of the submission module (user interface). For example, by selecting the desired date range, and using the "Show Stats" Command, the

desired tabular report based on data/information contained in database 116 will be generated (Whiting, pars. 42 and 45).

With regard to claim 16:

Boyd in view of Whiting describes that a second database (analysis results 18A-C) configured to receive relevant website traffic data, the relevant website traffic data being obtained by processing the navigation histories (traffic data 11), and wherein the report (summaries 19A-C) are generated by querying the second database (18A-C) (Boyd, column 4, lines 23-32).

With regard to claim 20:

Boyd in view of Whiting discloses the computer network includes an Internet (Boyd, Fig. 1, #13).

5. Claims 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd et al (U.S. 6,112,238) in view of Whiting (US Pub 2002/0156552) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Casati (2003/0084142).

With regard to claims 4, 12 and 21:

Boyd in view of Whiting describes parsing or examining each traffic data hit 11 and stores the access information obtained from the traffic data as analysis results 18A-C (see Boyd, column 3, lines 50-61). Boyd in view of Whiting, however, does not explicitly describe that parsing or examining each traffic data / navigational data includes removing unreliable data. Casati

discloses a method for analyzing of Internet based service. Casati further describes data from a log 41 is checked and cleaned 210 by a first ETL data checker 71 to remove invalid data (unreliable data) invalid or nonsensical data (par. 36).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method used in removing invalid log data with Boyd in view of Whiting. The motivation for doing so would have been to selectively filtered log data or valuable log data that can be saved and processed for generating a report, according reliable and accurate report can be generated.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Boyd in view of Whiting with Casati to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 12 and 21.

With regard to claims 6 and 23:

Boyd in view of Whiting discloses a data warehouse (e.g., Boyd, database 16, Fig. 1) for storing larger amount of raw traffic data 11 received from the client computer (e.g., remote system 12). Boyd in view of Whiting also discloses a datamart to store analyzed or filtered data, traffic data (e.g. Boyd, Analysis Results databases18A-C, Fig. 1).

With regard to claims 8 and 13:

As described above Boyd in view of Whiting, especially as described by Boyd each access by a remote user to the server results in a "hit" of raw traffic

data 11 (or navigation data) these data are analyzed/parsed to generating trend and statistical information on ad hoc basis.

Although, the trend and statistical information can be used/configured to deliver advertisement over the Internet is not explicitly described, Casati describes that user navigation data can be configured for advertising service over the Internet. Casati discloses advertising service providers seek to provide the services in an efficient and desirable manner to the user or client (Casati, par. 2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the advertisement service of Casati with Boyd in view of Whiting. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate an effective advertisement to each particular user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Boyd in view of Whiting with Casati to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 13.

6. Claims 5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd et al (U.S. 6,112,238) in view of Whiting (US Pub 2002/0156552) and further in view of Casati (2003/0084142) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Stuart et al (U.S. 6,661,431).

With regard to claims 5 and 22:

While the above applied as applied to claim 4 rejection describes removing invalid or unreliable data, but the applied art does not explicitly describe that the unreliable data includes "short term consumers" as required in claim 5. Stuart is directed to a method of representing high-dimensional information.

Stuart also describes generating traverse or navigation data, affixing a time stamp to the data (step 226, Fig. 16). Context vectors (data) for web pages visited for a long duration will be more heavily weighted than web pages visited by the users (i.e., user's browser) for only a brief period ("short term consumers") (column 17, lines 36-63). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the weighting function, the context vector (data) to a visited page which may include time stamp with the above applied art. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase the accuracy of the summary context vector (data) of each web page of a website (column 17, lines 50-52).

CONCLUSION

7. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and Figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent application information retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published application may be obtained from either Private -PAIR or Public-

Art Unit: 2173


PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private-PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, please see pair-direct.uspto.gov web site. Should you have questions regarding access to the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 – 7:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kincaid, Kristine, can be reached at (571) 272-4063 Art Unit 2173 and 2174.

Examiner Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit 2173 – Operator Interface

12/20/06


TADESSE HAILU
Patent Examiner